

# Dissipative stochastic sandpile model on small world network : properties of non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches

Himangsu Bhaumik\* and S. B. Santra†

*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati-781039, Assam, India.*

(Dated: December 21, 2016)

A dissipative stochastic sandpile model is constructed and studied on small world networks in one and two dimensions with different shortcut densities  $\phi$ , where  $\phi = 0$  represents regular lattice and  $\phi = 1$  represents random network. The effect of dimension, network topology and specific dissipation mode (bulk or boundary) on the steady state critical properties of non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches along with all avalanches are analyzed. Though the distributions of all avalanches and non-dissipative avalanches display stochastic scaling at  $\phi = 0$  and mean-field scaling at  $\phi = 1$ , the dissipative avalanches display non trivial critical properties at  $\phi = 0$  and 1 in both one and two dimensions. In the small world regime ( $2^{-12} \leq \phi \leq 0.1$ ), the size distributions of different types of avalanches are found to exhibit more than one power law scaling with different scaling exponents around a crossover toppling size  $s_c$ . Stochastic scaling is found to occur for  $s < s_c$  and the mean-field scaling is found to occur for  $s > s_c$ . As different scaling forms are found to coexist in a single probability distribution, a coexistence scaling theory on small world network is developed and numerically verified.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k, 05.65.+b, 64.60.aq, 64.60.av

## I. INTRODUCTION

Power-law scaling in many natural phenomena such as earthquakes [1], forest fires [2], biological evolution [3], droplet formation [4], superconducting avalanches [5], etc. are found to be outcome of self organized criticality (SOC) [6] which refers to the intrinsic tendency of a wide class of slowly driven systems to evolve spontaneously to a non equilibrium steady state. At the same time, self-organization on complex structures or networks are found to appear very often in nature. For example, avalanche mode of activity in the neural network of brain [7], earthquake dynamics on the network of faults in the crust of the earth [8], rapid rearrangement of coronal magnetic field network [9], propagation of information through a network with a malfunctioning router causing the breakdown of the Internet network [10], blackout of the electric power grid [11] and many others. On the other hand, small world network (SWN) [12] not only interpolates between the regular lattice and the random network but also it preserves both the properties of regular lattice and random network, namely high “clustering-coefficient” (concept of neighborhood) and “small-world-effect” (small average shortest distance between any two nodes) respectively. It is always intriguing to study the models of SOC on networks such as SWN.

Sandpile, a prototypical model to study SOC introduced by Bak, Tang, and Wiesenfeld (BTW) [13]. Though BTW on regular lattice gives rise to anomalous (multi) scaling [14, 15], it shows a mean-field scaling [16–19] when studied on random network. A transition from non-critical to critical behaviour was reported in BTW

type sandpile model on SWN in one dimension (1d) [20] whereas a continuous crossover to mean-field behaviour was reported for the same model on SWN in two dimension (2d) [21]. However recent study of BTW model on SWN in 2d shows the co-existence of more than one scaling forms in the distributions of avalanche properties [19]. On the other hand, stochastic sandpile models (SSM) on regular lattice, which incorporates random distribution of sand grains during avalanche, exhibit a scaling behaviour with definite critical exponents that follows finite size scaling (FSS) and define a robust universality class called Manna class [22]. More insight in avalanche size distribution statistics were obtained by classifying the avalanches into dissipative and non-dissipative avalanches. The size distribution of dissipative avalanches of BTW sandpile in 2d was found to follow power law scaling with a definite exponent that does not obey FSS [23]. Later, Dickman and Campelo [24] showed both in one and two dimensions that the dissipative and non-dissipative avalanches of SSM on regular lattice obey different FSS behaviour with certain logarithmic correction beside the power law scaling with different exponents. However, there are not many studies that report the critical behaviour of SSM and specially that of the stochastic dissipative avalanches on networks. It is then intriguing to study avalanche size distribution of dissipative and non-dissipative avalanches of a stochastic sandpile model on SWN which interpolates regular lattice and random network, and verify whether all such scaling forms would be preserved or not under bulk dissipation mode.

In this paper, a dissipative stochastic sandpile model (DSSM) is constructed on SWN and studied as a function of shortcut density  $\phi$  in both one and two dimensions. The distribution functions of the steady state avalanche properties as well as those of dissipative and non-dissipative avalanches on regular lattice ( $\phi = 0$ ) and

\* himangsu@iitg.ac.in

† santra@iitg.ac.in

random network ( $\phi = 1$ ) are found to display several interesting non-trivial features which are not reported before. Moreover, in the small world regime with intermediate  $\phi$  ( $\approx 2^{-12}$  to  $2^{-3}$ ) [25], the steady state avalanche properties exhibit coexistence of the SSM scaling and the mean-field scaling in a single distribution depending on the avalanche sizes. A coexistence scaling theory is developed and numerically verified.

## II. THE MODEL

SWN is generated both on a 1d linear lattice and on a 2d square lattice by adding shortcuts between any two randomly chosen lattice sites which will be referred as nodes later on. The shortcut density  $\phi$  is defined as the number of added shortcuts  $N_\phi$  per existing bond ( $dL^d$  bonds are present in a  $d$ -dimensional lattice of linear size  $L$  with periodic boundary conditions (PBC) and without shortcuts) and is given by  $\phi = N_\phi/(dL^d)$ . Care has been taken to avoid self-edges of any node and multi-edges between any two nodes. To study sandpile dynamics on an SWN, first an SWN is generated for a particular value of  $\phi$  and it is then driven by adding sand grains, one at a time, to randomly chosen nodes. If the height  $h_i$  of the sand column at the  $i$ th node becomes greater than or equal to the predefined threshold value  $h_c$ , which is equal to 2 here, the  $i$ th node topples and the height of the sand column of the  $i$ th node will be reduced by  $h_c$ . The sand grains toppled are then distributed among two of its randomly selected adjacent nodes which are connected to the toppled node either by shortcuts or by nearest neighbour bonds. During distribution of the sand grains PBC is applied. Hence, there is no open boundary in the system where dissipation of sand grains could occur. A dissipation factor  $\epsilon_\phi$  is then introduced during transport of a sand grain from one node to another to avoid overloading of the system. The toppling rule of  $i$ th critical node in this DSSM on SWN then can be represented as

$$h_i \rightarrow h_i - h_c, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{and } h_j = \begin{cases} h_j + 0 & \text{if } r \leq \epsilon_\phi, \\ h_j + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $j$  is two randomly selected nodes out of  $k_i$  adjacent nodes of the  $i$ th node,  $r$  is a random number uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ . In this distribution rule, an adjacent node may receive both the sand grains. If the toppling of a node causes some of the adjacent nodes unstable, subsequent toppling follows on these unstable nodes. The process continues until there is no unstable node present in the system. These toppling activities lead to an avalanche. During an avalanche no sand grain is added to the system.

For a given SWN,  $\epsilon_\phi$  is taken as  $1/\langle n_\phi \rangle$ , where  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$  is the average number of steps required for a random walker to reach the lattice boundary (without PBC) starting from an arbitrary lattice site. There exists a characteristic

$\phi$	$\epsilon_\phi$	
	$d = 1, L = 8192$	$d = 2, L = 1024$
0	$8.94 \times 10^{-8}$	$6.83 \times 10^{-6}$
$2^{-9}$	$5.10 \times 10^{-7}$	$6.34 \times 10^{-5}$
$2^{-8}$	$9.72 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.12 \times 10^{-5}$
$2^{-7}$	$1.81 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.34 \times 10^{-4}$
$2^{-6}$	$3.60 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.99 \times 10^{-4}$
$2^{-5}$	$7.10 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.96 \times 10^{-4}$
1	$1.27 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.06 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE I. Dissipation factor  $\epsilon_\phi$  for selected values of  $\phi$  on 1d lattice of  $L = 8192$  and 2d square lattice of size  $L = 1024$ .

length  $\xi \sim \phi^{-1/d}$  where  $d$  is the dimensionality of the lattice, below which SWN belongs to the “large world”, the regular lattice regime, and beyond which it behaves as “small world”, the random network regime [26, 27]. The asymptotic behaviour of  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$  with  $\phi$  and  $L$  is given by

$$\langle n_\phi \rangle \sim \begin{cases} L^2, & \phi \rightarrow 0 \\ L\phi^{-1/d}, & \phi \rightarrow 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

for a  $d$  dimensional SWN. It has diffusive behaviour for  $\phi \rightarrow 0$  and super-diffusive behaviour for  $\phi \rightarrow 1$ . The above scaling form is numerically verified in Ref. [19]. The dissipation factor  $\epsilon_\phi = 1/\langle n_\phi \rangle$  for a given  $\phi$  is determined using numerically estimated values of  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$ . A few values of  $\epsilon_\phi$  are listed in Table. I for 1d and 2d lattices.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extensive computer simulations are performed to study the dynamics of DSSM on SWN in 1d and 2d. After a transient period, the system evolves to a steady state which corresponds to equal currents of sand influx and outflux resulting constant average height of the sand columns. Critical properties of DSSM on SWN are characterized studying various avalanche properties in the steady state at different values of  $\phi$  and system size  $L$ . The maximum lattice size used for 1d is  $L = 8192$  and that for 2d is  $L = 1024$ . Data are averaged over  $32 \times 10^6$  avalanches collected on 32 different SWN configurations for a given  $\phi$  and  $L$ . The information of an avalanche is kept by storing the number of toppling of every node in an array  $S_\phi[i], i = 1, \dots, L^d$  which was set to zero initially. All geometrical properties of an avalanche such as avalanche size  $s$ , avalanche area  $a$ , etc. can be estimated in terms of  $S_\phi[i]$  as given below

$$s = \sum_{i=1}^{L^d} S_\phi[i], \quad a = \sum_{i=1}^{L^d} 1 \quad (3)$$

for all  $S_\phi[i] \neq 0$ .




FIG. 1. (Color online) The toppling surfaces of typical large avalanches of DSSM on SWN are shown. Toppling surface of an avalanche generated on a 1d lattice of size  $L = 256$  for  $\phi = 0$  is in (a) and for  $\phi = 1$  is in (b). The surface generated on a 2d square lattice of size  $L = 256$  for  $\phi = 0$  is in (c) and for  $\phi = 1$  is in (d). The size ( $s$ ) and area ( $a$ ) of the corresponding avalanches are mentioned as legend in the respective plots.

### A. Toppling Surface

The values of the toppling number  $S_\phi[i]$  of an avalanche at different nodes of SWN define a surface called toppling surface [28] which serves as an important geometrical quantity to visualize an avalanche. The toppling surfaces for typical large avalanches in the steady state, generated on a 1d lattice of size  $L = 256$ , are presented for  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = 1$  respectively in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b). Toppling surfaces generated on a 2d square lattice of size  $L = 256$  are presented in Fig. 1(c) for  $\phi = 0$  and for  $\phi = 1$  in Fig. 1(d). In both the dimensions, the maximum height of the surfaces on regular lattice ( $\phi = 0$ ) are much higher than that on random network ( $\phi = 1$ ). Though the maximum height is very less in 1d for  $\phi = 1$ , all the lattice site toppled more than once whereas in 2d, the toppling surface on random network consists of mostly singly toppled sites, only 0.06% of the sites toppled more than once. The toppling surfaces are found very different on regular lattice and random network in different dimensions.

### B. Moment analysis at $\phi = 0$ & 1

The critical steady state of sandpile model is mostly characterized by power-law scaling of the probability distributions of avalanche size ( $s$ ) occurring in the steady state. For a given  $\phi$  and  $L$ , the probability to have an avalanche of size  $s$  is given by  $N_{s,\phi}/N_{\text{tot}}$  where  $N_{s,\phi}$  is the number of avalanches of size  $s$  out of total number of avalanches  $N_{\text{tot}}$  generated at the steady state. The distribution of  $s$  follows a power law scaling with a well defined exponent  $\tau$  and obeys FSS [14]. The FSS form




FIG. 2. (Color online) Plot of  $P_\phi(s, L)$  of all the avalanches for  $\phi = 0$  (a) for 1d and (b) for 2d.  $P_\phi(s, L)$  for  $\phi = 1$  are plotted in (c) and (d) for 1d and 2d respectively. Different curves corresponds to different system size  $L$  as, for 1d,  $L = 2^{10}$  (black solid line),  $L = 2^{11}$  (red dotted line),  $L = 2^{12}$  (green dashed line), and  $L = 2^{13}$  (blue dotted dashed line), whereas, for 2d they are  $L = 2^7$  (black solid line),  $L = 2^8$  (red dotted line),  $L = 2^9$  (green dashed line),  $L = 2^{10}$  (blue dotted dashed line). Upper inset in each figure shows the plot of  $\partial\sigma_\phi(q)/\partial q$  against  $q$  whereas, the lower inset shows the corresponding FSS data collapse.

of the probability distribution of  $s$  in DSSM is given by

$$P_\phi(s, L) = s^{-\tau} f_\phi \left[ \frac{s}{L^D} \right] \quad (4)$$

where  $f_\phi$  is a  $\phi$  dependent scaling function and  $D$  is the capacity dimension. Very often the power law scaling is found to sustain over a short range of avalanche sizes and hinders precise extraction of the exponent  $\tau$  from the slope of the plot of  $P_\phi(s, L)$  against  $s$  in double logarithmic scale. A more reliable estimate of the exponent can be made employing moment analysis [15, 29]. For a given  $\phi$ , the  $q$ th moment of  $s$  is defined as

$$\langle s^q(L) \rangle_\phi = \int_0^\infty s^q P_\phi(s, L) ds \sim L^{\sigma_\phi(q)} \quad (5)$$

where,

$$\sigma_\phi(q) = D(q - \tau + 1) \quad (6)$$

is the moment scaling function for  $q > \tau - 1$  (for  $q < \tau - 1$ ,  $\sigma_\phi(q) = 0$ ). Values of  $\sigma_\phi(q)$  are estimated from the slope of the plots of  $\langle s^q(L) \rangle_\phi$  versus  $L$  in double logarithmic scale for 400 equidistant values of  $q$  between 0 and 4. The value of  $D$  can be measured from the saturated value of  $\partial\sigma_\phi(q)/\partial q$  in large  $q$  limit. The derivative  $\partial\sigma_\phi(q)/\partial q$  is determined numerically by finite-difference method. Once  $D$  is known the exponent  $\tau$  can be esti-




FIG. 3. (Color online) Plot of  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  for different  $L$  (with same symbol as in Fig. 2) for  $\phi = 0$  in (a) for 1d and in (b) for 2d. For  $\phi = 1$  the same has been plotted in (c) and (d) for 1d and 2d respectively. Insets in each figure are same as that of Fig. 2 but for non-dissipative avalanches.

mated from Eq. (6) using the value of  $\sigma_\phi(1)$ .

**All avalanches :**  $P_\phi(s, L)$  of all the avalanches for various values of  $L$  are presented in Fig. 2 for 1d and 2d for  $\phi = 0$  and 1. Reasonable power law scaling are observed for these extreme values of  $\phi$  in both the dimensions. The flat tail in  $P_\phi(s, L)$  for  $\phi = 1$  in 1d is due to large dissipative avalanches which will be discussed later separately. Employing moment analysis, values of  $D$  and  $\tau$  are estimated at all four situations. For  $\phi = 0$ , estimates of  $D$  are found to be  $2.21 \pm 0.02$  and  $2.76 \pm 0.02$  for 1d and 2d respectively. Since for  $\phi = 0$ ,  $\sigma_\phi(1) \approx 2$  in both the dimensions, the values of  $\tau$  estimated from Eq. (6) are  $1.09 \pm 0.02$  in 1d and  $1.28 \pm 0.01$  in 2d. As expected, the exponents are found very close to the reported values for SSM on regular lattice in respective dimensions [24, 30, 31], for instance in 1d  $\tau = 1.112 \pm 0.006$ ,  $D = 2.253 \pm 0.014$  and in 2d  $\tau = 1.273 \pm 0.002$ ,  $D = 2.750 \pm 0.006$  for SSM. Whereas for  $\phi = 1$ , the values of  $D$  are found to be  $1.39 \pm 0.02$  and  $\approx 2$  in 1d and 2d respectively. In 2d, the avalanches on random network ( $\phi = 1$ ) consist mostly single toppled nodes, hence  $D \approx 2$  is expected whereas the value of  $D > 1$  in 1d suggests that the avalanches consist of multiple toppled nodes. In both the dimensions, the value of  $\tau$  for  $\phi = 1$  is  $\approx 1.50$ , the mean-field value as obtained in branching processes [16–18]. The values of the exponents are listed in Table II. The FSS form of  $P_\phi(s, L)$  is verified by plotting the scaled distribution  $P_\phi(s, L)L^{D_\tau}$  against the scaled variable  $s/L^D$  in the respective lower inset of Fig. 2 using the respective values of the critical exponents obtained.

**Non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches:** Avalanches are now classified into non-dissipative and




FIG. 4. (Color online) Plot of  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  for various  $L$  (with same symbol as in Fig. 2) for  $\phi = 0$  in (a) for 1d and in (b) for 2d. For  $\phi = 1$  the same has been plotted in (c) and (d) for 1d and 2d respectively. Upper insets: (a)-(c) shows the plot of  $P_{\phi,d}(1, L)$  against  $L$ , (d) shows variation of  $\partial \sigma_{\phi,d}(q)/\partial q$  against  $q$ . Lower insets shows the corresponding FSS data collapse (see text).

dissipative avalanches. During the evolution, a dissipative avalanche must dissipate at least a sand grain once whereas no sand grain be dissipated in a non-dissipative avalanche. The avalanche size distribution  $P_\phi(s, L)$  can be written in terms of  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  and  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$ , the distributions of non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches, as

$$P_\phi(s, L) = P_{\phi,nd}(s, L) + P_{\phi,d}(s, L) \quad (7)$$

with

$$P_{\phi,nd}(s, L) = \frac{n_{s,nd}}{N_{tot}} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\phi,d}(s, L) = \frac{n_{s,d}}{N_{tot}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $n_{s,nd}$  and  $n_{s,d}$  are number of non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches of size  $s$  out of total  $N_{tot}$  avalanches. First, the analysis of non-dissipative avalanches is given and then that of dissipative avalanches is presented.

The FSS form of the distribution  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  is assumed to be

$$P_{\phi,nd}(s, L) = s^{-\tau_{nd}} f_{\phi,nd} \left[ \frac{s}{L^{D_{nd}}} \right] \quad (9)$$

where  $f_{\phi,nd}$  is a scaling function,  $\tau_{nd}$  and  $D_{nd}$  are the respective exponents.  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  for  $\phi = 0$  and 1 are plotted in Fig. 3 for several values of  $L$  for both 1d and 2d. Performing moment analysis, the values of  $D_{nd}$  are found as  $D_{nd} \approx 2$  for  $\phi = 0$  and  $D_{nd} \approx 1$  for  $\phi = 1$  in both 1d and 2d. It could be recalled here that the dissipation factor is chosen from the inverse of  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$ . On an average



	non-dissipative	dissipative	all	
1d	$\phi = 0$	$D_{nd} = 2.009$	$D_d = 2.214$	$D = 2.215$
		$\tau_{nd} = 1.11(2)$	$\tau_d = 0.14(1)$	$\tau = 1.09(2)$
	$\phi = 1$	$D_{nd} = 1.022$	$D_d = 1.402$	$D = 1.395$
		$\tau_{nd} = 1.52(2)$	$\tau_d = 0.54(2)$	$\tau = 1.50(1)$
2d	$\phi = 0$	$D_{nd} = 2.004$	$D_d = 2.791$	$D = 2.764$
		$\tau_{nd} = 1.29(1)$	$\tau_d = 0.40(2)$	$\tau = 1.28(1)$
	$\phi = 1$	$D_{nd} = 1.013$	$D_d = 2.023$	$D = 2.008$
		$\tau_{nd} = 1.54(5)$	$\tau_d = 1.45(3)$	$\tau = 1.51(2)$

TABLE II. Best estimated values of  $D$  and  $\tau$  for DSSM in 1d and 2d at  $\phi = 0$  and at  $\phi = 1$  for non-dissipative avalanches, dissipative avalanches, and all avalanches. As the values of  $D$  is estimated from  $\partial\sigma_\phi(q)/\partial q$  the error in determination of  $D$  is  $2\Delta q$  i.e.  $\pm 0.020$ . The number in the parentheses is the uncertainty of last digit of the value  $\tau$  determined from the scaling relations.

the avalanche of size  $s > \langle n_\phi \rangle / 2$  must dissipate at least one sand grain (the factor 2 is for one toppling consists two sand transfer). Since  $\langle n_\phi \rangle \sim L^2$  as  $\phi \rightarrow 0$  due to diffusive behaviour of random walker on regular lattice and  $\langle n_\phi \rangle \sim L$  as  $\phi \rightarrow 1$  for super-diffusive behaviour of random walker on random network [19], the cutoff of  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  must scales with  $L$  in the same way as  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$  scales with  $L$ . Knowing the values of  $D_{nd}$  and  $\sigma_{\phi,nd}(1)$ , the values of  $\tau_{nd}$  are estimated. The values of  $\sigma_{\phi,nd}(1)$  are found as 1.78 for  $\phi = 0$  and 0.48 for  $\phi = 1$  in 1d. Accordingly,  $\tau_{nd} = 1.11(2)$  for  $\phi = 0$  and  $\tau_{nd} = 1.52(2)$  for  $\phi = 1$  in 1d. The power law scaling of  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  is found similar to that of  $P_\phi(s, L)$  as the values of  $\tau$  and  $\tau_{nd}$  are found more or less same for both the distributions for  $\phi = 0$  and 1. Whereas in 2d, the values of the exponents are found as  $\tau_{nd} = 1.29 \pm 0.01$  for  $\phi = 0$  (since  $\sigma_{\phi,nd}(1) = 1.4$ ) and  $\tau_{nd} = 1.54 \pm 0.05$  for  $\phi = 1$  as  $\sigma_{\phi,nd}(1) = 0.5$ . On regular lattice it is the SSM result whereas on random network it is the mean-field result. The values of  $D_{nd}$  and  $\tau_{nd}$  for non-dissipative avalanches are listed in Table II. Using the values of  $\tau_{nd}$  and  $D_{nd}$ , a reasonable data collapse is obtained for  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$  as shown in the lower insets of Fig. 3.

The size distribution of dissipative avalanches  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  for several values of  $L$  are presented in Fig. 4 for  $\phi = 0$  and 1 in both the dimensions. Interestingly, the distributions  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  are very different in nature than the corresponding  $P_{\phi,nd}(s, L)$ . Preliminary estimate of the size distribution exponent  $\tau_d$  by linear least square fit to the data points in double-logarithmic scale reveals that  $\tau_d < 1$  except for  $\phi = 1$  in 2d. Following Christensen and co-workers [32], a new scaling form of  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  is proposed as

$$P_{\phi,d}(s, L) = s^{-\tau_d} L^{D_d(\tau_d-1)} f_{\phi,d} \left[ \frac{s}{L^{D_d}} \right] \quad (10)$$

where  $f_{\phi,d}$  is a new scaling function,  $\tau_d$  and  $D_d$  are exponents for dissipative avalanches. The moment of such a distribution is obtained as  $\langle s^q(L) \rangle_{\phi,d} \sim L^{\sigma_{\phi,d}(q)}$




FIG. 5. (Color online) Plot of  $f_{\phi,d}(= P_{\phi,d}(s)s^{\tau_d})$  (in solid black line) and  $f_{dc}(= P_{\phi,d}(s)s^{\tau_d}[\ln(s)]^{-\eta})$  (in dashed red line) against  $s$  for 1d,  $L = 8192$ , in (a) and for 2d,  $L = 1024$ , in (b). The values of the  $\tau_d$  and  $\eta$  for  $f_{dc}$  are taken from Ref. [24]. Since the plots are for a given  $L$ , the  $L$  dependency of the argument is dropped.

where  $\sigma_{\phi,d}(q) = qD_d$ . Noticeably, the moment exponent  $\sigma_{\phi,d}(q)$  becomes independent of the size distribution exponent  $\tau_d$ . Performing moment analysis for both 1d and 2d, the values of  $D_d$  for dissipative avalanches are found close to that of the all avalanches as presented in Table II. In the limit  $s/L^{D_d} \rightarrow 0$ , the scaling function  $f_{\phi,d}[s/L^{D_d}]$  becomes a constant and the distribution is given by  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L) \approx s^{-\tau_d} L^{D_d(\tau_d-1)}$ . Consequently,  $P_{\phi,d}(1, L) \sim L^{D_d(\tau_d-1)}$  for  $s = 1$ . The exponent  $\tau_d$  is then estimated from the slope of the plot of  $P_{\phi,d}(1, L)$  vs  $L$  in double logarithmic scale as presented in the upper insets of Figs. 4 (a), 4(b), and 4(c). The values of  $\tau_d$  are estimated as  $0.14 \pm 0.01$  for  $\phi = 0$  and  $0.54 \pm 0.01$  for  $\phi = 1$  in 1d. It is interesting to note that such a flat distribution (i.e.  $\tau_d \rightarrow 0$  for  $\phi = 0$  in 1d) is also reported by Amaral and Lauritsen [33] for the dissipative avalanches of 1d rice pile model. In contrary to the present observation, Dickman and Campelo [24] found a power law scaling of  $P_d(s, L)$  with exponent  $\tau_d = 0.637$  for SSM with boundary dissipation on 1d regular lattice. In 2d, the exponent  $\tau_d$  is obtained here as  $0.40 \pm 0.02$  for  $\phi = 0$  whereas Dickman and Campelo [24] reported  $\tau_d = 0.98$  for SSM on 2d regular lattice with boundary dissipation. Thus the scaling behaviour of dissipative avalanches of DSSM is very different from that of dissipative avalanches of SSM with boundary dissipation in both the dimensions at  $\phi = 0$ . Such difference in the scaling behaviour for dissipative avalanches with different modes of dissipation is probably due to different topological properties of network in the bulk and at the boundary because the degree of a node at the boundary is different from that of a node in the bulk. Moreover, it should be noted that for the model of boundary dissipation, Dickman and Campelo introduced a logarithmic correction in the distribution of dissipative avalanches and the distribution was given by

$$P_{dc}(s, L) = s^{-\tau_d} [\ln(s)]^\eta f_{dc} \left[ \frac{s}{L^{D_d}} \right] \quad (11)$$

where  $\eta$  is an another exponent. In order to verify whether such correction to scaling is present in the present model with bulk dissipation or not, the scaling

function  $f_{\phi,d}$  given in Eq. (10) for  $\phi = 0$  is plotted in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b) for 1d and 2d respectively. For comparison, the scaling function  $f_{dc}$  that of the model with boundary dissipation given in Eq. (11) is also plotted in the respective plots. It can be seen that without any correction, the scaling function  $f_{\phi,d}$  is reasonably constant over a wide range of  $s$  in double logarithmic scale in the case of bulk dissipation whereas that requires a correction to scaling,  $[\ln(s)]^\eta$ , in the case of boundary dissipation for  $d = 2$  ( $\eta = 0.5$ ) as observed by Dickman and Campelo [24]. Hence the scaling forms considered here for the model with bulk dissipation are not subject to any logarithmic correction. However, the scaling behaviour of all avalanches are found to be same for both the models as reported in ref [34]. This is because the leading singularity is provided by non-dissipative avalanches. In order to verify the form of the scaling function given the Eq. (10), data collapse has been performed by plotting  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)L^{D_d}$  against  $s/L^{D_d}$  for different values of  $L$ . Reasonable data collapse for different  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  are obtained as shown in the respective lower insets of Figs. 4. For  $\phi = 1$  in 2d, the FSS form of the distribution  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  is expected to follow the usual distribution as given in Eq. (4). From the plot of  $\partial\sigma_{\phi,d}(q)/\partial q$  vs  $q$  as given in upper inset of Fig. 4(d),  $D_d$  is found to be  $2.023 \pm 0.020$ , again close to the value of all avalanches. The value of  $\tau_d$  is estimated from Eq. (6) as  $1.45 \pm 0.03$  little less than mean-field result as obtained for the all avalanches. However, taking  $\tau_d = 3/2$  and  $D_d = 2.023$  the best data collapse is obtained, given in lower inset of Fig. 4(d), which confirms the respective form of the scaling function. It should be noted here that the value of  $D_d$  for dissipative avalanches are very close to the value of  $D$  of the all avalanches for both the extreme values of  $\phi$  in both the dimensions because the large avalanches which are responsible for cutoff of the distribution of all avalanches are mostly dissipative, and in the moment analysis the leading contribution comes from those large dissipative avalanches.

### C. Small world regime

**Scaling properties:** Since SWN preserves both the characteristic of regular lattice and random network, it is important to study the critical properties of the avalanche size distribution in the SWN regime,  $2^{-12} < \phi < 0.1$ . The size distribution  $P_\phi(s)$  of all the avalanches are plotted in Fig. 6(a) for 1d and in Fig. 6(b) for 2d. In Fig. 6(c) and (d),  $P_{\phi,d}(s)$  are plotted for 1d and 2d respectively. For 1d and 2d, the values of  $\phi$  used are  $2^{-6}$  and  $2^{-8}$  respectively for both the distributions. Interestingly, both the distributions  $P_\phi(s)$  and  $P_{\phi,d}(s)$  exhibit their respective scaling forms on regular lattice ( $\phi = 0$ ) and random network ( $\phi = 1$ ) in the same distribution. The straight lines with respective slopes in these plots are guide to eye. The crossover from one scaling form to other occurs at their respective crossover avalanche




FIG. 6. (Color online) Plot of  $P_\phi(s)$  against  $s$  in (a) for 1d with  $\phi = 2^{-6}$  for  $L = 8192$  and in (b) for 2d with  $2^{-8}$  for  $L = 1024$ . The corresponding  $P_d(s, \phi)$  is shown in (c) for 1d and in (d) for 2d. The solid lines with required slope through data points are guide to eye. The variation of  $s_c$  with  $\phi$  is shown in respective inset. The error in estimation of  $s_c$  is of the order of symbol size.

size  $s_c$  for  $P_\phi(s)$  and  $P_{\phi,d}(s)$ . For  $s < s_c$ , the avalanches are small, compact and mostly confined on regular lattice whereas for  $s > s_c$ , they are large, sparse and mostly exposed to random network. Since  $P_{\phi,nd}(s)$  and  $P_\phi(s)$  have similar scaling behaviour,  $P_{\phi,nd}(s)$  display a similar crossover scaling as that of  $P_\phi(s)$ . The coexistence of more than one scaling forms in the same distribution of avalanche properties for different sandpile model are already reported in the literature [19, 20, 35]. The crossover scaling is found to occur for a wide range of  $\phi$  within SWN regime for both  $P_\phi(s)$  and  $P_{\phi,d}(s)$ . As one expects the scaling form of regular lattice as  $\phi \rightarrow 0$  and that of random network as  $\phi \rightarrow 1$ , the value of  $s_c$  is found to depend on  $\phi$  for both the distributions. The dependence of  $s_c$  on  $\phi$  is assumed as

$$s_c \sim \phi^{-\alpha} \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha$  is an exponent. The value of  $\alpha$  for all avalanches can be obtained by simple arguments. From the conditional expectation of avalanche size for a fixed avalanche area, one expects  $s_c \sim a_c^{\gamma_{sa}} \approx \xi^{d\gamma_{sa}}$ , where  $a_c$  is the average avalanche area for the avalanches of size  $s_c$ ,  $\gamma_{sa}$  is an exponent [16], and  $\xi$  is the crossover length scale below which SWN behaves as regular lattice [26, 27]. As  $\xi \sim \phi^{-1/d}$ , one obtains  $s_c \sim \phi^{-\gamma_{sa}}$  and has  $\alpha = \gamma_{sa}$ . However, a dissipative avalanche occurs only after a required number of toppling equivalently  $\langle n_\phi \rangle$ . As  $\langle n_\phi \rangle \sim \phi^{-1/d}$  in the large  $\phi$  limit corresponding to random network, one expects  $s_c \sim \phi^{-1/d}$  with  $\alpha = 1/d$ . For a given  $\phi$




FIG. 7. (Color online) Scaled probability distribution (for all avalanches) against scaled variable is plotted for selected values of  $\phi$  in (a) for 1d with  $L = 8192$  and in (b) for 2d with  $L = 1024$  to verify the scaling forms given in Eq. (14). The same has been verified for dissipative avalanches in (c) for 1d and in (d) for 2d.

the value of  $s_c$  is estimated from the intersection point of the straight lines with required slope in the respective regions. The estimated values of  $s_c$  is then plotted against  $\phi$  in double logarithmic scale in the respective insets of Fig. 6. It can be seen that in all cases  $s_c$  shows a reasonable power-law scaling with  $\phi$ . By linear least square fit through the data points the values of  $\alpha$  for all avalanches are found to be  $1.92 \pm 0.01$  for 1d and  $1.24 \pm 0.01$  for 2d which are very close to the  $\gamma_{sa}$  values at  $\phi = 0$  in both the dimensions [36, 37]. On the other hand, for dissipative avalanches it is found that  $\alpha = 1.07 \pm 0.02$  for 1d and  $\alpha = 0.54 \pm 0.03$  for 2d again close the inverse of respective dimensions.

**Coexistence scaling:** Since FSS forms of  $P_\phi(s, L)$  and  $P_{\phi,d}(s, L)$  are found to be satisfied both on regular lattice and on random network, they should also be satisfied on SWN. Instead of FSS form, the  $\phi$  dependence of these distributions are then verified on SWN for a fixed  $L$ . A generalized scaling form for  $P(s, \phi)$  for the all avalanches on SWN is proposed as

$$P(s, \phi) = \begin{cases} s^{-\tau_1} f\left(\frac{s}{s_c(\phi)}\right) & \text{for } s \leq s_c \\ s^{-\tau_2} g\left(\frac{s}{s_c(\phi)}\right) & \text{for } s \geq s_c \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $f$  and  $g$  are the respective scaling functions and  $\tau_1$ ,  $\tau_2$  are the corresponding critical exponents in  $s < s_c$  and  $s > s_c$  regions respectively. At  $s = s_c$  for a given  $\phi$ , the limiting values of  $P(s, \phi)$  from both the regions must be same. As  $s_c \sim \phi^{-\alpha}$ , then one should have  $\phi^{\tau_1 \alpha} f(1) = \phi^{\tau_2 \alpha} g(1)$ . Hence, the  $\phi$  independent scaled distribution

can be obtained as

$$P(s, \phi) \phi^{-\alpha \tau_1} = \begin{cases} (s \phi^\alpha)^{-\tau_1} f(s \phi^\alpha) & \text{for } s \leq s_c \\ (s \phi^\alpha)^{-\tau_2} f(s \phi^\alpha) & \text{for } s \geq s_c \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

in terms of a single scaling function  $f$  [19]. Such scaling form is also found to exist in the dynamic scaling of roughness of fractured surfaces [38]. To verify the scaling forms given in Eq. (14), the scaled probabilities for all avalanches are plotted against the scaled variable in Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) for 1d and 2d respectively taking  $\alpha = \gamma_{sa}$ . It can be seen that a good data collapse is obtained using  $\gamma_{sa} = 2$ ,  $\tau_1 = 1.1$  for 1d and using  $\gamma_{sa} = 1.26$ ,  $\tau_2 = 1.28$  for 2d. The straight lines with required slopes in the respective regions are guide to eye. It confirms the validity of the proposed scaling function form given in Eq. (13). Similarly, a generalized size distribution function can be written for dissipative avalanches around its crossover size  $s_c$  taking  $\alpha = 1/d$ . The scaled probabilities for  $P_d(s, \phi) \phi^{-1/d}$  for dissipative avalanches are plotted against the scaled variable  $s \phi^{1/d}$  in Figs. 7(c) and 7(d) for 1d and 2d respectively. Reasonable data collapse is obtained as expected. It is then important to notice that if a dynamical model like sandpile is studied on SWN, multiple scaling forms of an event size will coexist in the distribution of the same.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A dissipative stochastic sandpile model is developed and its critical properties are studied on SWNs both in 1d and 2d for a wide range of shortcut density  $\phi$ . The non-dissipative avalanches display usual stochastic scaling of SSM on regular lattice ( $\phi = 0$ ) and mean-field scaling on random network ( $\phi = 1$ ) as that of all avalanches. However, the dissipative avalanches represent a number of novel scaling properties on regular lattice as well as on random network in both 1d and 2d. The scaling behaviour of these avalanches on regular lattice is found to be very different from Dickman-Campelo scaling as observed with open boundary in both the dimensions. The bulk dissipation is found to have non-trivial effect on dissipative avalanches over the boundary dissipation. No logarithmic correction to scaling is found to occur as it was required for these avalanches on regular lattice with boundary dissipation. A set of new scaling exponents are found to describe the scaling of dissipative avalanches on regular lattice and random network. On SWN, in the intermediate range of  $\phi$ , the model exhibits coexistence of more than one scaling forms both in 1d and 2d around a crossover size  $s_c(\phi)$ . For non-dissipative and dissipative avalanches, however, the crossover size  $s_c$  scales with  $\phi$  with two different exponents. The small, compact avalanches of size  $s < s_c$  mostly confined on regular lattice are found to obey the usual SSM scaling whereas the large, sparse avalanches of size  $s > s_c$  exposed to random network are found to obey mean-field scaling. A coexistence scaling form of the avalanche size

distribution function around  $s_c$  is proposed and numerically verified. Therefore, SWN can be considered as a segregator of several scaling forms that appear in the event size distribution in a dynamical system.

**Acknowledgments:** This work is partially supported by DST, Government of India through project No. SR/S2/CMP-61/2008. HB thanks MHRD, Government of India for financial assistance. Availability of computational facility, “Newton HPC” under DST-FIST project Government of India, of Department of Physics, IIT Guwahati is gratefully acknowledged.

- 
- [1] K. Chen, P. Bak, and S. P. Obukhov, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 625 (1991).
  - [2] B. Drossel and F. Schwabl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1629 (1992); B. Drossel, S. Clar, and F. Schwabl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3739 (1993).
  - [3] P. Bak and K. Sneppen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4083 (1993).
  - [4] B. Plourde, F. Nori, and M. Bretz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2749 (1993).
  - [5] S. Field, J. Witt, F. Nori, and X. Ling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1206 (1995).
  - [6] P. Bak, *How Nature Works: The Science of Self-Organized Criticality* (Copernicus, New York, 1996); H. J. Jensen, *Self-Organized Criticality* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998); K. Christensen and N. R. Moloney, *Complexity and Criticality* (Imperial College Press, London, 2005); G. Pruessner, *Self-Organized Criticality: Theory, Models and Characterization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012).
  - [7] L. de Arcangelis, C. Perrone-Capano, and H. J. Herrmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 028107 (2006); J. Hesse and T. Gross, Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience **8**, 166 (2014).
  - [8] S. Lise and M. Paczuski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 228301 (2002).
  - [9] D. Hughes, M. Paczuski, R. O. Dendy, P. Helander, and K. G. McClements, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 131101 (2003).
  - [10] A. E. Motter and Y.-C. Lai, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 065102 (2002).
  - [11] B. Carreras, D. Newman, I. Dobson, and A. Poole, IEEE Trans. Circ. Syst. I **51**, 1733 (2004).
  - [12] D. Watts and S. Strogatz, Nature **393**, 440 (1998).
  - [13] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 381 (1987); Phys. Rev. A **38**, 364 (1988).
  - [14] M. DeMenech, A. L. Stella, and C. Tebaldi, Phys. Rev. E **58**, R2677 (1998); C. Tebaldi, M. DeMenech, and A. L. Stella, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3952 (1999).
  - [15] S. Lübeck, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 204 (2000).
  - [16] K. Christensen and Z. Olami, Phys. Rev. E **48**, 3361 (1993).
  - [17] E. Bonabeau, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64**, 327 (1995).
  - [18] K.-I. Goh, D.-S. Lee, B. Kahng, and D. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 148701 (2003).
  - [19] H. Bhaumik and S. B. Santra, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 062817 (2013).
  - [20] J. Lahtinen, J. Kertsz, and K. Kaski, Physica A **349**, 535 (2005).
  - [21] L. de Arcangelis and H. Herrmann, Physica A **308**, 545 (2002).
  - [22] S. S. Manna, J. Phys. A **24**, L363 (1991); D. Dhar, Physica A **263**, 4 (1999), and references therein.
  - [23] B. Drossel, Phys. Rev. E **61**, R2168 (2000).
  - [24] R. Dickman and J. M. M. Campelo, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 066111 (2003).
  - [25] M. E. J. Newman, A. Barabási, D. J. Watts, and P. G. de, *The Structure and Dynamics of Networks* (New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers. Copyright ©2010 by Princeton University Press, USA, 2010).
  - [26] M. E. J. Newman and D. J. Watts, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 7332 (1999); M. Newman and D. Watts, Physics Letters A **263**, 341 (1999).
  - [27] M. A. de Mendes, C. F. Moukarzel, and T. J. P. Penna, Europhys. Lett. **50**, 574 (2000).
  - [28] J. A. Ahmed and S. B. Santra, Europhys. Lett. **90**, 50006 (2010).
  - [29] R. Karmakar, S. S. Manna, and A. L. Stella, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 088002 (2005).
  - [30] R. Dickman, M. A. Muñoz, A. Vespignani, and S. Zapperi, Brazilian Journal of Physics **30**, 27 (2000).
  - [31] H. Huynh, G. Pruessner, and L. Chew, J. Stat. Mech **2011**, P09024 (2011); H. N. Huynh and G. Pruessner, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 061133 (2012).
  - [32] N. Farid and K. Christensen, New Journal of Physics **8**, 212 (2006); K. Christensen, N. Farid, G. Pruessner, and M. Stapleton, The European Physical Journal B **62**, 331 (2008).
  - [33] L. A. N. Amaral and K. B. Lauritsen, Phys. Rev. E **54**, R4512 (1996).
  - [34] O. Malcai, Y. Shilo, and O. Biham, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 056125 (2006).
  - [35] M. Hoore and M.-A. S., J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 195001 (2013); S. Moghimi-Araghi and M. Sebtosheikh, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 022116 (2015); S. A. Moosavi and A. Montakhab, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 052804 (2015).
  - [36] H. Nakanishi and K. Sneppen, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 4012 (1997).
  - [37] A. Ben-Hur and O. Biham, Phys. Rev. E **53**, R1317 (1996); S. B. Santra, S. R. Chanu, and D. Deb, Phys. Rev. E **75**, 041122 (2007).
  - [38] J. M. López and J. Schmittbuhl, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 6405 (1998); S. Morel, J. Schmittbuhl, J. M. López, and G. Valentin, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 6999 (1998).